



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,082	08/21/2001	Jyothis Indirabhai	WIDC-026/00US	8557

7590 03/13/2009
CHRISTOPHER C. WINSLADE
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

DOAN, PHUOC HUU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/13/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/935,082	INDIRABHAI, JYOTHIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHUOC DOAN	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 01/13/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. In response to the Applicant's remarks on pages 7-10, the Examiner disagrees, Muller respectfully discloses distributing a global clock (Fig. 2, the common time reference 20) to a first master device (Fig. 1, item 2) from the plurality of master devices wherein said first master device operates according to a local clock that is independent of said global clock (column 2, paragraphs [0030], and paragraph [0038]); determining an offset between said global clock and said local clock (column 4, paragraphs [0049-0051]).

In combine with Muller in the same filed of endeavor, Taylor the same feature as the claim recited such a global time reference when it includes its local time reference in a packet or signal that it broadcasts to the other device in specifically used global time reference 306 and local time references at the time when the frame synchronization is maintained among a plurality of network devices having local clocks that participate in a network. It also compared to the time when the frame sync sequence signal based on the real timing between global time reference and local time reference to distributing the network whether or not master or slave to fined

an offset between the global clock and the local clock to distributed and offset ether master device or another devices (see paragraph [30, 40-41]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Muller (US Pub No: 2002/0031196) in view of Taylor (US Pub No: 2002/0131398)**.

As to claim 1, 10, Muller et al discloses a method for distributing timing information amongst a plurality of master devices, the method comprising: distributing a global clock (Fig. 2, the common time reference 20) to a first master device (Fig. 1, item 2) from the plurality of master devices wherein said first master device operates according to a local clock that is independent of said global clock (column 2, paragraphs [0030], and paragraph [0038]); determining an offset between said global clock and said local clock (column 4, paragraphs [0049-0051]); However, Muller does not

specifically disclose that distributing timing information and distributing timing, and distributing said offset to at least one master device other than said first master device.

Taylor specifically discloses disclose that distributing timing (col. 2, par [0030] “global time reference when it includes its local time reference in a packet or signal that it broadcasts to the other device”), and distributing said offset to at least one master device other than said first master device (col. 3 through col. 4, par [0040-0041] “ a wireless network ad hoc network, blue-tooth (BT) environment with number of particular devices as the master clock to do the **function of clock offset based on the difference between the global time reference and the local time reference** which indicated all of the **device clocks on the network**”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of master devices as taught by Taylor to the system of Muller in order to transfer to another device without being required to resynchronize adjust the slave devices.

As to claim 2, Muller further discloses that wherein said global clock comprises a local clock of one of the plurality of master devices (Fig. 1, paragraph [0047]).

As to claim 3, Muller further discloses that offset is distributed over a communication pathway linking said first one of said master devices to said at least one of said master devices (col. 4, par [0040]).

As to claim 4, Muller further discloses that wherein said communication pathway comprises a wired communication pathway (col. 4, par [0040]).

As to claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

As to claim 6, Muller et al further discloses that wherein said distributing said offset comprises storing said offset in a memory accessible to said plurality of master devices (column 4, paragraph [0051]).

As to claim 7, Muller et al further discloses that wherein said distributing said offset comprises providing said offset upon receiving a request from one of said plurality of master devices (column 4, paragraph [0053]).

As to claim 8, Muller et al further discloses that wherein each of said plurality of master devices stores said offset (column 4, paragraph [0049]).

As to claim 9, Muller et al further discloses that wherein said master device comprises a Bluetooth.TM. device configured to act as a master (column 1, paragraph [0018], and column 3, paragraph [0040]).

As to claim 11, Muller et al further discloses that wherein each of said master devices includes a local oscillator and wherein said global clock comprises a clock signal generated by the local oscillator associated with one of the plurality of master devices (column 4, paragraph [0050]).

As to claim 12, Muller further discloses that offset is stored in a central location and provided to at least one of said master devices (col. 3, par [0040]).

As to claim 13, Muller further discloses that offset is stored locally at said second master device (col. 3, par [0040]).

As to claim 14, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

As to claim 15, claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 16, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

As to claim 17, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

As to claim 18, Muller et al further discloses that wherein said global clock comprises one of said local clocks (column 4, paragraph [0050]).

As to claim 19, Muller et al further discloses that comprising a memory coupled to said communication pathway, wherein said offsets are stored in said memory (column 4, paragraph [0049]).

As to claim 20, Muller et al further discloses that wherein said offset is distributed upon request by one of said master devices (column 4, paragraph [0051], and column 5, paragraph [0066]).

As to claim 21, Muller et al further discloses that wherein each of said master devices further includes a local memory for storing offsets associated with at least one of said master devices (column 4, paragraph [0049]).

As to claim 22, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

As to claim 23, claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 24, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4.

As to claim 25, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5.

As to claim 26, Muller further discloses all the limitations in Fig. 1

As to claim 27, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 19.

As to claim 28, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 20.

As to claim 29, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 21.

As to claim 30, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the

Art Unit: 2617

mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUOC DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7920. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LESTER KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PHUOC DOAN/
03/12/09

/Lester Kincaid/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617